

Editorial 2009

Marcel V. J. Veenman

Published online: 16 January 2009

© The Author(s) 2009. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

This is the first issue of Volume 4 of *Metacognition and Learning*. Since the onset of the journal in 2006, the number of submissions has gradually increased, the scope of the submitted papers has broadened, and the geographic origin of submitted papers has extended. The editorial team will continue to maintain a high quality selection of papers, thanks to the anonymous contributions of our reviewers. In the last issue of this year we will publish a list of reviewers over the last four years, acknowledging their contribution to the journal.

In our introductory paper (Veenman et al. 2006), the editorial team clearly advanced the journal to be a platform of discussion amongst metacognition researchers from various perspectives. To that purpose we have reserved five pages in every issue for reactions of the readership on published articles, so far with little response. Comments of approximately 4–5 pages (max. 2,000 words) will be welcomed and reviewed by the editorial team, and published in the forthcoming issue of *Metacognition and Learning* along with a response from the original author(s).

This special issue is devoted to a symposium at the Annual meeting of AERA in New York, March 2008, entitled “How best to assess metacognition, or why asking is just not enough.” This symposium was organized by the current coordinators of the EARLI Special Interest Group 16 on Metacognition, Zemira Mevarech and Stephanie Pieschl. It brings together two strands of research into metacognition, that is, research into accuracy and metacognitive monitoring on the one hand, and research into the assessment of metacognition in young children on the other.

In a theoretical paper, Pieschl argues for a reconceptualization of the concept of metacognitive calibration. She contends that the construct of calibration should be extended to external criteria in addition to internal standards, and that the construct should be related to enacted metacognitive control strategies. Schraw discusses five measures of metacognitive monitoring. His theoretical contribution is an extension to an earlier chapter in an edited volume by Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser (in press).

M. V. J. Veenman (✉)

Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology, Leiden Institute of Psychological Research,
Leiden University, Wassenaarse weg 52, 2333 AK Leiden, The Netherlands
e-mail: veenman@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Shamir, Mevarech, and Gida present the results of a study assessing young children's metacognition in individual vs. peer-assisted learning situations. More specifically, they assess Theory of Mind of 5-year olds, and compare their declarative and procedural metacognitive knowledge in both learning situations. Whitebread presents the results of a large-scale study assessing the metacognitive skills of 3-5 year old children with observations from video protocols and a teacher's checklist. Both studies address some perennial issues related to the assessment of metacognition in young children. Finally, Roger Azevedo puts together the symposium in his discussion of the four contributions, and their theoretical, methodological and instructional implications.

This special issue bears a lot of fruit for discussion and the editorial team explicitly invites you to respond to the positions taken in the contributions to this issue. In general, we welcome you to comment on any (future) publications in *Metacognition and Learning* so as to promote a lively discussion of relevant issues in the study of metacognition.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

Reference

- Veenman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning*, 1, 3–14.